

an
hina

CHINA INSTITUTE IN AMERICA
TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY DINNER
STARLIGHT ROOF, WALDORF-ASTORIA • MAY 18, 1951



PROGRAM

Invocation

THE REVEREND BISHOP HERBERT WELCH

Introductory Remarks

THE HONORABLE CHARLES EDISON

Toastmaster

HENRY R. LUCE

Addresses

THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES
UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR

THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

THE HONORABLE PAUL H. DOUGLAS
SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

Response

BRIGADIER GENERAL EDWIN N. CLARK
PRESIDENT, CHINA INSTITUTE IN AMERICA

CHINA INSTITUTE IN AMERICA

25 years of service for Chinese-American friendship

CHINA INSTITUTE IN AMERICA was founded in May, 1926, as a non-profit, educational institution dedicated to the promotion of better understanding between the Chinese and American people.

One of its principal functions has been to bridge the gap between America and China through contact with Chinese students and scholars who come to the United States. Today there are 3625 Chinese students in 555 American colleges and universities. China Institute provides opportunities for these visitors to know the American people and their ways.

During its twenty-five year history, China Institute has administered approximately 1800 scholarships and fellowships and has assisted and advised over 30,000 students, professional scholars and other cultural groups. It has given direct emergency aid to Chinese students and scholars, a service made particularly necessary by the events of the last several years.

The Institute took a leading part in persuading the Congress of the

United States to appropriate for Chinese students stranded in this country monies from unexpended ECA funds which have financed the board and tuition of many scholars eager to carry on their studies in America.

To broaden and foster American understanding of China, the land and its people, China Institute initiates and cooperates in the establishment of educational courses, lectures, art exhibitions, discussions and meetings for the study of Chinese history and culture.

China Institute in America has its headquarters at China House, 125 East 65th Street, New York. Here, in addition to other study and discussion groups, courses are offered to New York City Public School teachers.

Since its opening seven years ago, a total of more than 53,000 persons have attended various educational and social events at China House, and it has become the meeting center for Chinese visitors and their American friends.

Address by

CHARLES EDISON

Former Secretary of the Navy and former Governor of New Jersey

Thank you, Harry Luce, and good evening ladies and gentlemen:

In the narrow sense, the purpose for which we are gathered here tonight is to recognize the China Institute in America for its quarter century of outstanding service in fostering good Chinese-American relations.

In the broader sense, we are here to compare those twenty-five years, with what this year, next year, and future years hold in store for relations between China and America.

We may not come up with any decisive answers. But if all of us are inspired to think harder and more clearly on the subject, then we will indeed have fulfilled our reasons for being here.

Fourteen years ago, in 1937, I made an entry in my diary. It read: "The first half of the Twentieth Century will be known as the Age of Turmoil and the second half as the Age of Chaos—unless."

I reaffirm that entry tonight.

But unless what? It will truly be the Age of Chaos unless we as individual Americans search our hearts and minds and find there once again the will to have it otherwise—unless we find there the character to express that will in action.

Nations are merely the sum total of the individuals that compose them.

If the individuals who are the United States have the character to stand for something honorable and fine, at whatever price, we are invincible. But if we lack this ingredient, then we are merely marking time while national disaster fattens on internal decay.

Among the elements of character I want especially to commend to you tonight is that of loyalty to friends—not a frivolous loyalty to self-serving friends, but a basic loyalty to honorable friends.

Be cautious in the selection of friends; be sure of their fidelity; then be unyielding in your devotion to them.

For generations the friendship between people of China and the people of the United States has been becoming more widespread and more deeply rooted. We of the United States have gained a greater appreciation of China and the Chinese people—of their vast contributions to civilization.

They, on the other hand, turned to us for counsel and training in building the new China destined to play a major part in the modern world.

Trade, missionaries, Christian colleges, the Red Cross, the United Service to China, the exchange of students and other activities

of the China Institute of America, and countless other groups and forces have all contributed to this greater understanding, mutual respect and friendship. These are matters of the people apart from their governments.

But, in the field of government, here too, the tie that binds was growing stronger over the years.

Twenty-five years ago the founder of the Republic of China, Sun Yat Sen, turned his back on the lethal poison of Communism and began to build a new China with the United States as his model and inspiration. Chiang Kai Shek was at his side then and has carried on unswervingly since Dr. Sun's passing. From that time on the overwhelming majority of China's 450 million individuals became solidly our friends and the government under Chiang Kai Shek an unwavering ally. We could be friends because our ideals, our goals, were the same.

What we have done or should do with that tremendous asset is involved in the so-called Great Debate now in progress, of which this dinner tonight is a part. I have joined that debate in print and on other platforms. Those statements concerned more immediate policy. Tonight I want to make just one point if I can and that concerns the long look ahead.

I believe that whatever may happen in this world of chaos in which we live, one thing seems certain: Sooner or later China's millions will emerge as a great and worthy people, and so will we of the United States. At that happy time these two peoples should stand shoulder to shoulder on one platform built of honor, understanding, mutual respect, solid friendship and compatible ideals.

If through any action of ours, or lack of it—if through fear, selfishness, expediency, or compromise between right and wrong—in other words, if through lack of character we substitute in Chinese hearts contempt for respect, and hate for friendship, our children's children will have reason to curse our generation.

Hatred breeds desolation more basic and lasting than the thunder of guns. In Japan, under MacArthur, we learned how to substitute friendship for hatred. We must not, in China, substitute hatred for friendship.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is our job. Each and everyone of us has an individual part to play in the tragic drama of today's events. Think out what your part is and learn your lines well. Then act.

If the bigness of the set intimidates you or if you feel that "your one little voice won't count," as so many have told me, remember the line used by the Christophers—"better to light one candle than to curse the darkness."

The American form of government is a representative form. We ourselves are the government. Our individual and collective wills when made known to our representatives ultimately control the policy and the destiny of our country.

Three of our representatives are our speakers tonight. They are men whose thoughts, whose voices and whose actions carry great weight in the halls of government. They are, as we are, a part of the Great Debate.

They have come here to tell us what they feel and think, and we thank them. It is an American privilege to agree or disagree with what they have to say or what they do—but it is American duty to let them know which. That is one candle you can light.

Earlier I said be cautious in choosing friends. I think I have been cautious in appraising the Chinese people as our friends—even the vast majority of those temporarily under the Communist heel. They have stood the test of time; they have stood the test of sacrifice. I am certain they are worthy of our friendship.

I am not so certain we are worthy of theirs.

Let me recall to your memories that when we were bombed at Pearl Harbor, when we were being swept from the Philippines, when the Japanese were wresting from England, France and the Netherlands their Pacific and Asiatic possessions, there were stout Chinese hearts fighting invaders from without and Communist aggression from within.

It was these same stout Chinese hearts that, under the cruelest handicaps, fought on as our friends and allies without thought of surrender or compromise. With the blood of countless sons, China bought time for America to rearm and blast her long and bloody trek back across the Pacific to victory. One million Japanese troops were held in China by these faithful friends of ours—one million troops that could not be used against us.

Again today, there are countless Chinese, both within and without China's mainland, who stand willing and ready to "buy time" for America to rearm against a new enemy.

I do not lay claim to being an authority on China or on any other subject, for that matter. But my tour of duty in the Navy and later my association with United Service to China and other Chinese activities have given me a chance to meet many people that know plain facts—a chance to weigh evidence and to appraise loyalties. I appraise the vast majority of the Chinese people as our friends, perhaps the best friends we have left.

They are entitled to the same unalloyed and unstinted loyalty from us in their dark hour of need as they gave to us in ours.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the course of the Japanese war, before

Japanese hearts had been turned from hatred to friendship, an American flier was shot down behind the Japanese front lines. He parachuted down into a small Chinese village where the villagers, although not speaking a word of English, hid him in a nearby cave, fed him, and eventually guided him to safety. Having spotted the parachuting flier, Japanese troops were in the village within an hour. They herded the villagers into a field and demanded to know the whereabouts of the American. No one volunteered the information. The Japanese officer in charge threatened to burn every home in the village. When this produced no results, the threat was carried out.

Infuriated, the Japanese officer made a still more terrible threat. "Tell me where the American is hidden," he demanded, "or I will kill every fifth one among you."

But still not one of the villagers breathed a word of the American boy's hideout. The villagers faced the execution squad and every fifth one of these fine, unpretentious Chinese civilians paid with their lives the price of loyalty to an American flier and to America.

Greater love hath no man than to lay down his life for a friend.

In the Press on May 6th, there appeared a minor item on the eleventh page to the effect that reports that two million Chinese civilians had been liquidated for deviation from Communist doctrine were probably exaggerated; that, in fact, only a few hundred thousand had been executed.

Only a few hundred thousand! And these were our friends.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is time for something more than tolling of bells.

Address by

THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES

United States Ambassador

CHINESE-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

One of my most prized possessions is a letter I received when 8 years old from Li Hung Chang, then the great Chinese elder statesman. The opening sentence of the letter reads: "To the little grandchild of General Foster, my friend and counsellor in my hours of perplexity and trouble."

That letter is to me symbolic of what have been, and always should be, the relations between our peoples.

It breathes the spirit of fraternal friendship between their old, and our young, society. It reflects the kindly good humor and respect for home and family ties which make it easy for Americans to understand and to love the Chinese character. It confesses the troubles and perplexities which inevitably confront an ancient civilization when it is pressed upon by the thrusts of a restless new outer world. It testifies to the value to be found in counsel which is understanding and loyal.

That, you may say is sentiment. So it is. Sentiment, rather than materialism, is, indeed, the essence of the relationship of the American people with the Chinese people. First, as colonists we came to know and admire Chinese art in terms of chinaware, wall paper, silks and lacquer. Later our clipper ships began directly to touch at China ports. But trade with China never grew to large proportions nor did Americans ever invest heavily in China. Always the contacts have been primarily cultural and spiritual, notably through missionaries.

The Tientsin Treaty of 1858 freely gave Christianity a special invitation. During the 19th Century scarcely a community in the United States was without at least a "share" in a missionary to China. Our church people regularly gathered together to fill missionary boxes for China and to hear read aloud the story of their China missionary and his Chinese friends and of the growing spiritual kinship between them. Later, Americans founded in China many Christian colleges, medical schools and hospitals and many Chinese students came to this country.

Only when the Spanish War made us a Western Pacific power did our relations with China become a matter of major governmental concern. We saw that the people of China should be allowed to develop in their own way which, we were confident, would be a peaceful way. We were fearful of the consequences if the Chinese became the tools of alien despots. So, Secretary Hay called for the "Open Door," Secretary Hughes made the Washington Treaty

to maintain China's integrity, Secretary Stimson proclaimed "non-recognition of the fruits of aggression." Finally, we accepted the probability of war with Japan rather than accept Japanese domination of China through the puppet regimes which Japan had set up in Manchukuo and Nanking.

During the long, hard Pacific war, the United States helped China, both morally and materially, and we looked forward to victory as opening a new era of closer friendship between us.

It comes as a brutal shock that today much of China is under the control of a regime which fanatically hates the United States and which has sent Chinese armies to Korea to kill Americans who are there at the behest of the United Nations.

The Chinese Communist attitude is exemplified by a widely publicized pamphlet written last October. The first section is entitled "We Must Hate America, Because She is the Chinese People's Implacable Enemy." There follows a recital of alleged historic incidents which blames the United States for almost all of China's troubles, beginning with the opium war which was allegedly supported by the American Navy.

The second section is entitled "We Must Despise America, Because it is a Corrupt Imperialistic Nation, the World Center of Reaction and Decadency." There follows a picture of the United States which is indeed startling: 18,000,000 unemployed; 10,000,000 with no housing whatsoever; 40,000,000 who barely exist in slums; 14,000 agents of the F.B.I. engaged in "the exclusive mission of persecuting the people"; 99% of the newspapers and magazines controlled by the National Association of Manufacturers and used for making the younger generation "spiritually decadent and halting their intellectual development, so that they may be driven to serve aggression and war."

The third section is entitled "We Must Look Down Upon America Because She is a Paper Tiger and Entirely Vulnerable to Defeat." There follows a picture of America without friends or allies, internally divided and confronted by the closely knit 830,000,000 peoples of China, Russia and the Russian satellite states. Our great industrial capacity is admitted but, it is said, this will be offset when Western Europe is "liberated" and, further, our concentrated industry is said to be particularly vulnerable to the Soviet Union's atom bombs. It concludes America faces "defeat which will be more disastrous than that which befell Hitler and Japan."

That is the regular party line. By print, by radio, by drama, by pictures, with all of the skills which Communism has developed, "Hate America, Despise America" is the sentiment being pounded into the Chinese people.

How has this come to pass? In part, no doubt, because of some errors on our part. But, in a larger sense, the present situation is the Soviet's reward for 30 years of hard work.

In 1924 Stalin revealed it as basic strategy that "the road to victory over the West" would be sought in Asia and particularly China. The 450,000,000 people of China must be made to serve the Soviet Communist program of world conquest. To this end a Chinese Communist Party was formed under the guiding direction of the Russian, Borodin. That Party, Soviet Russia has nurtured until it has matured into today's regime of Mao Tse-tung which serves as the instrument of Soviet Communism.

If any doubt that relationship, I remind them of these facts:

1. The Chinese Communist Party has consistently and publicly proclaimed its disciple-master relationship with Stalin and Soviet Russia. The following oft-repeated statement of Mao Tse-tung, first made in 1939, is typical:

"The fact that Stalin has come into the world is indeed fortunate. Today, when we have the Soviet Union, the Communist Party, and Stalin—all's right with the world."

2. The Soviet government paid a great price to bring the Chinese Communist regime into power and would only have done so to serve itself. Among other things, it openly dishonored its 1945 treaty whereby it undertook for 20 years to give its "moral support and aid in military supplies" entirely "to the National Government as the central government of China."

3. Mao Tse-tung, after winning mainland victories with the Soviet help we have referred to, went to Moscow at the end of 1949 where he spent nearly 3 months in consultation with the Soviet leaders. On his return, he broadcast to the peoples of Southeast Asia, calling upon them to seek liberation through "armed struggle" as part of the "forces headed by the Soviet Union." There followed Communist armed interventions in Korea, Indo-China, Tibet and the Philippines. These interventions conformed exactly with known Soviet wishes and, indeed, were forecast in advance by the Soviet official press.

4. These foreign policies of Mao Tse-tung are utterly irreconcilable with the interests of the Chinese people. After 14 years of exhausting war, they desperately need internal recuperation. No one in his senses could assert that it is in China's interest to shovel its youth and material resources into the fiery furnace of the Korean War to gain South Korea, an area which means little to China but which, since the Czars, has been coveted by Russia because of its strategic value against Japan.

By the test of conception, birth, nurture and obedience, the Mao Tse-tung regime is a creature of the Moscow Politburo and

it is on behalf of Moscow, not of China, that it is destroying the friendship of the Chinese people toward the United States.

What has happened is precisely what Stalin planned. In his 1924 lectures on Leninism, Stalin discusses what he calls "the national problem," that is, the problem of how aspirations for national independence can be fitted into the Soviet program of world conquest. Communist leaders in Asia must, he says, recognize that national independence is but a slogan wherewith to ride into power on anti-colonial sentiment. But, once in power, the Communist leaders must fight against the tendency of the masses toward "national insularity" and must seek "the amalgamation of these masses into a single state union" which is the goal of "Soviet power."

That is what is going on in China now. Anti-American sentiment is being whipped up to eradicate the influence of the West, ostensibly in the interest of national independence. But this popular hysteria is sought as a front behind which the Chinese people are being deprived of their independence and being betrayed into "amalgamation" with the mass which serves Moscow.

It is inevitable that many Chinese should be fooled by what is going on. But the American people and their government should not be fooled. We should treat the Mao Tse-tung regime for what it is—a puppet regime. The relationship to Moscow is camouflaged more craftily than was the relationship between the Japanese and the Nanking regime of Wang Ching-wei. Recent developments in the technique of propaganda enable it to win greater popular support and to depend less openly upon foreign military power. But the doctrine and the "iron discipline" of the Communist Party, Bolshevik, bind Mao Tse-tung to the service of Moscow more completely than was Wang Ching-wei ever bound to the service of Japan.

That could change. The Chinese people are today being abused to a degree that is causing many Chinese Communist leaders to feel rebellious against the subserviency to Moscow. But unless and until actual conduct gives clear proof of change, our national self-interest, our friendship for China and the historic dedication of our nation to the cause of human freedom combine to require that no act of ours shall contribute to a Mao Tse-tung "success" which could fasten the yoke of Moscow on the Chinese people.

My own official concern today is the Japanese Peace Treaty. I can assure you that, in negotiating that Treaty, we shall not consider that the voice of Mao Tse-tung is the voice of China.

While we thus adopt a negative attitude toward Mao Tse-tung and all his ilk, we should adopt a positive attitude toward the many Chinese who remain loyal to the welfare of China and to the

friendship between China and the United States which has in the past served China so well. Our own loyalty to those ideals should be demonstrated by deeds, public and private. It will not always be easy to find the way. But whatever the obstacles, however long and troubled be the way, we must be loyal to past and present friendships. We must work to preserve these friendships with persistence and resourcefulness at least equal to that which for 30 years Soviet Communism has devoted to undermining Chinese American friendship.

A great weakness is that we are not enough interested in long range programs. Because elections come so frequently there is a tendency on the part of the government to seek short cuts which can bear quick political fruit. There is a tendency to evade long, hard tasks.

That gives the Soviet Union a great advantage, for its planning is often in terms of what Stalin has referred to as "an entire historic era."

I am not advocating "slow motion" in the case of China. On the contrary, it is imperative that we move quickly, while we still have many friends, not only on Formosa but on the mainland, and possibilities of access to them. But we must not only start fast, we must start with long vision and endurance because we cannot overnight undo what has been accomplished by the best brains and skills of the Soviet Communist Party working with substantial resources over a span of 30 years.

Generally, and particularly in the Orient, great results are not achieved quickly and those who would succeed must dedicate themselves to sustained effort.

That is where our people come in. In the past our churches, colleges, private organizations and individuals have decisively molded and sustained our China policy. That must continue to be the case. Despite provocation and discouragements in China, the American people must persist in their faith in the Chinese people and the determination to find works which will express that faith. Thus hatred will succumb to friendship, servitude will give way to liberation and warfare will subside into peace.

We have entered upon a period of long trial. But true friendship has the capacity to survive the strain of misunderstanding, provocation and disappointment. It "Beareth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."

Those who have been friends of China, who inherit and would preserve that great tradition, have often been mocked because their plans have gone awry and their hopes have seemed vain. All of that is unimportant, so long as faith and determination persist. The friends of China may have been daily wrong—but they have been eternally right.

Address by

THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK

Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs

I should like, first of all, to congratulate the China Institute on its quarter century of splendid public service and to compliment you who are responsible for this timely chance to recall the warm friendship which has marked the relations between the Chinese and American people throughout the last two centuries.

Something of what we have in mind this evening is contained in a Concurrent Resolution which passed the Senate on May 4 and which is now before the House of Representatives which reads in part:

“Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States reaffirm the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, and declares —

“That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of the desire of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

“That the American people and their Government desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war;”

Despite the artificial barriers which now separate us from most of the peoples of China, we meet to reaffirm the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for the people of China.

Most of you here this evening are better qualified than I to explore the origins and elements of Chinese-American friendship. Over the centuries this friendship has come to be taken for granted; cordial sentiments between a free China and a free America became strong and durable because they were constantly nourished by common purposes and common practical interests.

We and the Chinese, for example, have had a vital interest in the peace of the Pacific. Each of us wants security on our Pacific flank and wants to be able to look across those vast waters to find strength, independence and good will in its great neighbor on the other side. It was inevitable that the driving force of Japanese militarism would sooner or later bring China and America together to oppose it, just as we had moved forty years earlier to support

China's independence and integrity against threats from Europe. The same issues are now posed again—and are made more difficult to deal with because foreign encroachment is now being arranged by Chinese who seem to love China less than they do their foreign masters.

We meet here this evening to reaffirm our friendship with the Chinese people—but not merely as a routine and elegant expression of good will. For the friendship we have taken for granted for so long is now being attacked with every available weapon by those who have come to power on the mainland of China. Their sustained and violent effort to erase all evidence of this friendship bears powerful witness to the validity and strength of the bonds between our two peoples. American influence among the Chinese people is intolerable to those in power in Peiping and Moscow because they know, and quite rightly, that the idea of national and individual freedom which is at the heart of American political thought is the greatest threat to their own evil purposes.

Is the message of this meeting this evening to our friends in China prompted solely by narrowly conceived American interests? That important American interests are involved, there can be no doubt. But our historical relations with China have always reflected a high regard on our part for Chinese interests and it is these we ask our friends in China now to consider.

The independence of China is gravely threatened. In the Communist world there is room for only one master—a jealous and implacable master, whose price of friendship is complete submission. How many Chinese, in one community after another, are now being destroyed because they love China more than the Soviet Union? How many Chinese will remember in time the fates of Rajk, Kostov, Petkov, Clementis and all those in other satellites who discovered that being Communist is not enough for the conspirators of the Kremlin?

The freedoms of the Chinese people are disappearing. Trial by mob, mass-slaughter, banishment as forced labor to Manchuria, Siberia or Sinkiang, the arbitrary seizure of property, the destruction of loyalties within the family, the suppression of free speech—these are the facts behind the parades and celebrations and the empty promises.

The territorial integrity of China is now an ironic phrase. The movement of Soviet forces into Sinkiang, the realities of “joint exploitation” of that great province by Moscow and Peiping, the separation of Inner Mongolia from the body politic of China, and the continued inroads of Soviet power into Manchuria under the cloak of the Korean aggression mean in fact that China is losing

its great northern areas to the European empire which has stretched out its greedy hands for them for at least a century. Are our Chinese friends reflecting upon the maps of China now being published on the mainland which show Sinkiang, Inner Mongolia, Manchuria and areas in the west and southwest as something distinct from China? Are our friends in China impressed by trade union buttons appearing on the streets of Peiping which no longer show Sinkiang and Inner Mongolia on the map of China? Have the authorities in Peiping themselves fully considered what it means for them to have Soviet troops on Chinese soil, in the light of the experience of the miserable satellites of eastern Europe?

The peace and security of China are being sacrificed to the ambitions of the Communist conspiracy. China has been driven by foreign masters into an adventure of foreign aggression which cuts across the most fundamental national interests of the Chinese people. This action stands condemned by the great world community in which the Chinese people have always aspired to play a worthy role. Hundreds of thousands of Chinese youth are being sacrificed in a fiery furnace, pitting their waves of human flesh against the fire power of modern weapons—and without heavy equipment, adequate supply or the most elementary medical attention. Apart from Korea, the Chinese are being pressed to aggressive action in other areas—all calculated to divert the attention and energies of China away from the encroachments of Soviet imperialism upon China itself.

I find it hard to believe that the Chinese people will acquiesce in the kind of future which their masters are now preparing for them. I find it impossible to believe that our friends in China have given up their desire to live at peace with their neighbors, to play a major role as a peaceful member of the international community of nations, to trade freely with all the world, to improve their own conditions in accordance with their own needs, aspirations and traditions, to maintain their independence as a nation, to preserve their territorial integrity and to live out their lives in dignity and with the respect of their fellow men.

Events in China must surely challenge the concern of Chinese everywhere—in Formosa, on the mainland and in overseas communities. There is a job to be done for China which only the Chinese can do—a job which will require sustained energy, continued sacrifice and an abundance of the high courage with which so many Chinese have fought for so long during the struggles of the past decades. The rest of us cannot tell them exactly what is to be done or how. We cannot provide a formula to engage the

unity of effort among all Chinese who love their country. But one thing we can say—as the Chinese people move to assert their freedom and to work out their destiny in accordance with their own historical purposes, they can count upon tremendous support from free peoples in other parts of the world.

It is not my purpose, in these few moments this evening, to go into specific elements of our own national policy in the present situation. But we can tell our friends in China that the United States will not acquiesce in the degradation which is being forced upon them. We do not recognize the authorities in Peiping for what they pretend to be. The Peiping regime may be a colonial Russian government—a Slavic Manchukuo on a larger scale. It is not the Government of China. It does not pass the first test. It is not Chinese.

It is not entitled to speak for China in the community of nations. It is entitled only to the fruits of its own conduct—the fruits of aggression upon which it is now willfully, openly and senselessly embarked.

We recognize the National Government of the Republic of China, even though the territory under its control is severely restricted. We believe it more authentically represents the views of the great body of the people of China, particularly their historic demand for independence from foreign control. That government will continue to receive important aid and assistance from the United States. Under the circumstances, however, such aid in itself cannot be decisive to the future of China. The decision and the effort are for the Chinese people, pooling their efforts, wherever they are, in behalf of China.

If the Chinese people decide for freedom, they shall find friends among all the peoples of the earth who have known and love freedom. They shall find added strength from those who refuse to believe that China is fated to become a land of tyranny and aggression and who expect China to fulfill the promise of its great past.

Address by

THE HONORABLE PAUL H. DOUGLAS

Senator from Illinois

I

American public opinion is now sharply divided over the question as to what we should do next in Korea and China. Passions run high and at times many of the contestants seem more interested in denouncing their American brothers who hold differing opinions than in attempting to work out a sound common policy upon which most men of good will can unite.

It is always personally dangerous to venture into such an arena and try to help develop a program which will resolve the internal political conflicts and enable the country to move forward with wisdom and with strength. And yet it is crucial in view of the bitterness which has attended the so-called MacArthur controversy that just such efforts as these should be made. This is my only excuse for speaking to you tonight. For I do not have any special knowledge of the Orient which would qualify me as an expert. This fact would ordinarily lead me to keep silent. But there are certain basic considerations which should be evident to and followed by all, although they have nevertheless been lost sight of in the hurly-burly of controversy.

The first is the saying of Winston Churchill, when he took over the British cabinet from the supine hands of Neville Chamberlain in the spring of 1940, and as the German armies crashed through the defenses of France and the Low Countries: "If we quarrel with our past," said Churchill, "we will destroy our future." Chamberlain and Baldwin were, it is true, shunted to the side-lines. But many who had mistakingly, though honestly, sought to appease Hitler and Mussolini but who, when the chips were down had rallied to the defense of their country, were allowed to serve it with their full strength. Thus Lord Halifax, though a member of the Cliveden set, was continued as Ambassador to this country where he served with credit. Heroic and impetuous Arnold Wilson, who in his magazine had certainly aided Hitler's policies, was permitted, though over-age, to serve in the Royal Aid Force and to die a heroic death defending his country in the Battle of Britain.

I have a similar feeling about the present emergency. I do not particularly care whether or not a man honestly advocated a coalition government in China in 1946 and 1947 and wanted to "let the dust settle" in 1948 and 1949, or whether he was then an ardent supporter of Chiang Kai-shek, who believed in our active intervention. Nor am I particularly concerned whether a man is

now an ardent supporter or an opponent of General MacArthur's proposals.

My concern is instead about the future, over which we can exercise some control, rather than about the past which has gone beyond repair. I am willing to forget the past provided only that in the here and now men join to recognize Russian communism for what it is; namely, a tyranny which seeks by aggression to impose the police state upon the world and which must be resisted by all our strength and with complete devotion.

I hope, therefore, that this dinner, joining as it does many who hitherto have been on opposite sides of the Chinese political fence, may enable us to face the future with spiritual unity untouched by past differences or present bitterness.

My second general observation is to repeat the famous dictum of Clausewitz, which has especial significance in our dealings with Soviet Communism and Asia; namely, that "war is merely a continuation of politics by other means." Both force and diplomacy *are* instruments of national policy. They are the right and left arms of the national purpose. Both of these sets of means are necessary and the practitioners of one cannot ignore the other, while both should be subordinate to the end of the national will.

II

What, then, is the national purpose in foreign affairs? I believe it is very simple and that all except a few extremists would agree both on what it is not and upon what it is.

1. Most emphatically, we do *not* want to create a new imperialism or to take over the Asiatic countries for ourselves. The day of imperialism is past, and its burdens are too heavy. On the contrary, we want the people of Asia to develop freely, and we wish to serve them only as friends, even as the China Institute has served countless Chinese students and nationals. We therefore glory in the newly developed nationalisms in Asia. We would like to see the remnants of colonialism transformed into genuinely democratic governments as rapidly as this can be done without playing into Communist hands. We are happy to have taken the lead in this direction by freeing the Philippines and by helping the Indonesian peoples to obtain their independence, and we shall try to help elsewhere.

2. We want to help assure future peace by joining with other nations to check aggression and the threat of aggression. Only if a potential aggressor knows that an overwhelming pooled force will be thrown against him, will he be deterred from taking the aggressive. That is why we were right in taking up the challenge in Korea, for had we not done so, further aggression would have swept over Asia and probably into Europe as well. But our pur-

U.S. Calls Red China Puppet, Pats Chiang

By JAMES DESMOND
The State Department last night renounced its "soft" policy toward Red China, branding the Peiping regime "a colonial Russian government" and pledging recognition and material assistance to Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government.

THE WASHINGTON POST
Saturday, May 19, 1951

Mao's Regime Is Soviet Rule, We'll Help Chiang, Rusk Says

NEW YORK, May 18 (AP)—Two leading American policy-makers tonight branded Mao Tse-tung as a Soviet puppet and appealed to the Chinese people to get rid of his Communist regime.

The two were Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Far Eastern Affairs, and John Foster Dulles, Republican adviser who has been heading the State Department's negotiations for a Japanese peace treaty.

Although neither said the United States would relax the seating of Red China in the United Nations, both said the Communist regime is under Moscow's thumb and therefore not entitled to represent the Chinese people.

"We do not recognize the authorities in Peiping for what they pretend to be," said Rusk, speaking at a dinner of the China Society here.

Called "Slavic Manchukuo"

"The Peiping regime may be a colonial Russian government, a Slavic Manchukuo on a larger scale. It is not the government of China. It does not pass the first test. It is not."

"It is not even China in the name. It is entitled only to the fruits of its own conduct—the fruits of aggression upon which it is now willfully, openly and shamelessly embarked."

"We recognize the national government of the Republic of China even though the territory under the control is severely restricted. We believe it more authentically represents the views of the great body of the people of China, particularly their historic demand for independence from foreign control."

Says It's "Soviet Instrument"

"The government will continue to receive important aid and assistance from the United States," Dulles, too, argued that the Chinese Communist regime is nothing but "the instrument of Soviet communism" and "a creature of the Moscow Politburo."

"Unless and until actual conduct gives clear proof of change," said Dulles, "our national self-interest, our friendship for China and the historic dedication of our Nation to the cause of human freedom combine to require that we continue to support the Nationalist Government."

Both speakers reaffirmed American friendship for China and the historic dedication of our Nation to the cause of human freedom combine to require that we continue to support the Nationalist Government."

Both speakers reaffirmed American friendship for China and the historic dedication of our Nation to the cause of human freedom combine to require that we continue to support the Nationalist Government."

Both speakers reaffirmed American friendship for China and the historic dedication of our Nation to the cause of human freedom combine to require that we continue to support the Nationalist Government."

Both speakers reaffirmed American friendship for China and the historic dedication of our Nation to the cause of human freedom combine to require that we continue to support the Nationalist Government."

U.S. Disavows Plan for Role in China Civil War

State Dept. Denies Rusk's Address Here Implied Active Hand in Conflict

By Ned Russell
WASHINGTON, May 21—Today's State Department denial that the United States favors American involvement in the Chinese civil war was in sharp contrast to the address by Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk at the Waldorf-Astoria.

In his address before the China Institute in America, Mr. Rusk, who is in charge of the Department's affairs at the State Department, clearly stated that the United States "nevertheless" has a "policy" to overthrow the Communist regime.

Instating that the United States "nevertheless" has a "policy" to overthrow the Communist regime, Mr. Rusk said that the United States "nevertheless" has a "policy" to overthrow the Communist regime.

more included today to accept Gen.issimo Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government as the only legitimate government of China.

Both the British and French governments made informal requests that the State Department should take action to help the Chinese people.

Mr. Rusk's speech may or may not be interpreted as a signal that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

One foreign diplomat in the United States said that Mr. Rusk's speech was a "clear signal" that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

Mr. Rusk's speech was a "clear signal" that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

Mr. Rusk's speech was a "clear signal" that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

Mr. Rusk's speech was a "clear signal" that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

Mr. Rusk's speech was a "clear signal" that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

Mr. Rusk's speech was a "clear signal" that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

Mr. Rusk's speech was a "clear signal" that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

Left to right: John Foster Dulles, State Dept. Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SATURDAY, MAY 19, 1951

RUSK HINTS U. S. AID TO REVOLT IN CHINA

Assistant Secretary Promises More Help to Nationalists—Dulles Calls Mao Puppet

By RUSSELL PORTER
Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, today in a speech here last night promised continued aid to the Chinese Nationalists and, by implication, offered to help the Chinese people if they revolted against their Communist masters.

"We pledge the United States will not recognize U. S. aid to the Nationalist Government in China," he said.

Rusk Hints U. S. Aids to Revolt in China

Mr. Rusk's speech "counter-attack" in China and in other satellite states of the Soviet Union, not by actual invasion, but by propaganda and assistance to resistance movements.

Dulles Positive On Peking Bar In Japan Treaty

Reds Will Have No Voice, He Tells China Institute; Calls Mao Soviet Puppet

John Foster Dulles, Republican adviser to the State Department, said last night that the United States would not support the Soviet Union and the puppet of the Soviet Union in the Japanese peace treaty.

Mr. Dulles, who is in charge of the Department's affairs at the State Department, clearly stated that the United States "nevertheless" has a "policy" to overthrow the Communist regime.

Mr. Dulles' speech was a "clear signal" that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

SEEKS UNITY IN FAR EAST FIGHT

Douglas Offers Com. Promise Plan

NEW YORK, May 18 (AP)—Senator Douglas of Illinois, in a bid to unite Douglas MacArthur's forces with Douglas MacArthur's forces, said Douglas tonight at a committee hearing in the Senate.

In a speech at the China Institute in America, he proposed a "unity plan" to unite Douglas MacArthur's forces with Douglas MacArthur's forces.

Mr. Douglas's speech was a "clear signal" that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

Mr. Douglas's speech was a "clear signal" that the United States is now taking a more active role in the Chinese civil war.

pose in resisting aggression is never war, but is always to bring a greater degree of ultimate peace. For peace and freedom from war and from fear of war is our goal.

3. We believe in the civil freedoms of life which we tend to take for granted as the air we breathe, but which are unalterably precious. We believe in the freedom of speech and of the press, and in the rights of men to worship God as they may choose. We believe in the rights of men and women to decide their own destinies by choosing between opposing political parties at fairly conducted elections. We are unalterably opposed to arresting men without a warrant, holding them for minor offenses without bail, sentencing them without a fair trial and torturing or working them to death in prisons or in camps. Such a tyranny was developed and fostered by the Nazis and would have spread over the earth had we not prevented it. It is practiced in as evil a fashion by Soviet Russia today. Civil rights on the other hand are an essential foundation of our striving for justice.

4. We want the people of Asia and of the world to enjoy prosperity as well as peace and liberty. Most of mankind, particularly in Asia, is desperately poor. Men who are starving or who are close to it cannot be expected to be deeply inspired with the blessings of political democracy and of civil liberties. Our country has not exploited these men, and we are not responsible for their poverty. Natural forces, such as the pressure of population and the lack of technical knowledge have been the main causes. But the great majority of Americans would like to help these unfortunates within the limits of our resources.

We want to do this first and foremost because we do not want any of mankind to suffer and because we realize there is no happiness quite so great as that which comes from helping others. But there is also a degree of enlightened self-interest in this desire. For we know if men can but live in modest comfort and are given an economic stake of private property, they will not line up with the Communists in their attempt to take over the world. This will strengthen our relative position. We also know that helping others to produce and enjoy more creates a bigger market for our goods and services so that the bread which we cast initially upon the waters will ultimately return.

All this justifies the extension of the Marshall Plan to Asiatic peoples in order to raise their output of farm, mineral and manufactured goods and to improve their health and literacy.

5. In return for our help, all that we ask is that the lives of the average Chinese, Korean, Indian and Malay be improved. One way to do this is by reducing landlordism and helping the small farmers to own their own land. Our own farm prosperity is largely

based upon such a wide distribution of land ownership and upon it, our political and social democracy also largely rests. We should, therefore, be in the forefront of the movement for agrarian reform in Asia.

In Japan we have carried out under General MacArthur perhaps the most thorough-going land reform in human history under which three million peasants who were formerly only laborers and tenants now own their small farms. On Formosa, we have helped to reduce rents and in the Philippines we have helped to establish a minimum wage. These goals, therefore, are not merely aspiration. We are actually working to carry them into effect, although the intensity and range of our efforts can be increased.

III

We have the right to ask the peoples of the world to subject Communist Russia and Communist China in turn to these five tests to see what their record is.

While the Communists talk against white, western imperialism as a means of whipping up Asiatic sentiment against the West and against us, the truth of the matter is, of course that *they* are now the great imperialists. This has long been evident in Europe. It is now being demonstrated in Asia. The Chinese Communists have largely given Manchuria to the Russians, the territory which 15 short years ago they said China should fight to retain. Russian advisers are apparently directing major Chinese policy. There is every indication that China is now a Russian puppet state and if a split should ever develop between the Chinese and the Russian Communists, it is far in the future.

It is similarly Chinese imperialism which now threatens the new nationalisms of the Malay people, and it is the Russians, and not the British and Americans, who are the present threat to the independence of India. Instead of fearing the old colonialisms which have disappeared or are disappearing, the people of Asia would do well to fear and to organize against the new imperialisms which are pressing in upon them from the North and which are proving far more brutal and repressive. In doing this, their place is with us and ours is with them.

Similarly it has been Russia and its puppets such as China which are now the aggressive forces in the world. It has been Russia which has taken over the Balkans, the Baltic countries, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, tried to intimidate Greece and Turkey, cut off land communications from Berlin, stirred up the North Koreans to attack last June and the Chinese to enter the war last November. It is Soviet Russia which threatens the peace everywhere and the government of Communist China is at present its agent.

Russian Communism became long ago the classic example of the

police state. It is slowly killing from 10 to 20 million political prisoners in its Russian work camps. It has abolished all civil liberties and installed similar camps in its European satellites. While the Chinese Communists in their early stages asserted that they would govern by consent, they have now embarked upon a ruthless program of physically exterminating all opponents and doubters of their regime. Reliable sources estimate that they have executed several hundred thousand men and women during the last few months. This has either been done without trial or after public trials which have been mockeries of justice. Wherever the Communists have come to power, they have introduced the police state with all its terrors. It had seemed impossible for any group to be more cruel than Hitler's Nazis, but the Communists seem determined to be it.

By their efforts to block the Marshall Plan and their systematic looting of the resources and productive facilities of occupied countries, and by their sacrifice of living standards to the demands of their aggressive war machine, the Communists have also proved they are not sincerely concerned about the prosperity or welfare of mankind but are interested only in power over mankind.

The last plank in our program is agrarian reform. The Communists always advocate this when they are trying to get power. Once in control, they do indeed divide the land among the peasants as an initial measure. But this is only a come-on. As soon as possible they recombine the small private holdings into collectives and ultimately into state farms. They shoot the open objectors and reduce the remainder to the status of employees.

All this is done in the name of increased productivity, but one of its purposes is to prevent the individual farmer from having the independence and exercising the individual initiative which an owner-occupant enjoys. The peasants of China who are now retaining some of the rents which they formerly paid to the landlords should realize that this is only temporary. When the Communists feel sufficiently strong, they will turn into "indian-givers" and pull the land away. The small farms will then be consolidated into bigger state farms and the peasants will lose even their former independence as tenants and will be reduced instead to the role of propertyless wage-earners in a state enterprise. Here, without property, they will be completely under the control of the Communists over-lords.

The United States is, therefore, a protector of the peace, the liberties, the independence and the prosperity of the Chinese and Asiatic peoples. Communism is, on the other hand, the destroyer of all these precious qualities. As the true friends of the Asiatic

peoples, we are justified in using force and diplomacy to help carry out these aims.

IV

We now come to a consideration of what policies we should adopt to further these ends. These policies can be classified into two groups, namely, the things we should *not* do and those which we should do.

First, I submit that it is obvious by now that we should *not* permit Red China to be seated as a member of the United Nations unless and until that government has given clear and prolonged evidence of repentance from their present policies of aggression and suppression. The United Nations should not reward aggression by admitting the aggressor to membership. Naturally we hope that the awakening consciousness of the British and French people, as well as those of other nations, will cause their governments to join us in opposing such action. But if necessary, we should be prepared to exercise the veto. For it is surely improper to place a government whose hands are bloody with aggression upon a tribunal to keep the peace.

Nor should we allow Formosa, whatever may be our views concerning the strategic importance of that island, to be taken over by the Chinese Reds. To do so would again be a reward for aggression and the loss of Chiang Kai-shek's army and countless political refugees to the Chinese Communists.

In the third place, it would be fatal to admit Red China to the discussion of the Japanese peace treaty. That would be an invitation to futility and further conflict. It is wiser instead to proceed without them.

I believe that American public opinion has crystallized in support of the three propositions which I have just stated, and from the testimony of General Marshall before the Joint Senate Committee I had inferred that the Administration had adopted all of them. Secretary Acheson's press interview of Wednesday, however, raises some doubt in my mind whether he is willing to use the veto.

There remains the question of Korea. There is no doubt that our effective resistance to aggression there has chewed up a large portion of the trained soldiers in the Communist armies and thereby has roused opposition among the Chinese people at being compelled to play the Russian game at so heavy a cost to themselves. We are, therefore, doing more to split the Chinese people away from the Russians than if we had constantly yielded to the Communist government in the hope that lavishly friendly treatment by us would induce Mao and his supporters to follow the Tito line. We have also prevented their taking over Indo-China

and moving on Malaya.

We should keep on administering crippling defeats to the Chinese Communists and hence weaken their military strength still further. But sooner or later we shall be forced to consider on what terms we would consent to a cease-fire order.

Here I wish to warn that great as is our desire for peace, it would be a bad mistake for us to agree to terms which would permit the armies or armed bands of the Communists to coerce the Koreans after our withdrawal into accepting a Communist government. For this reason, therefore, it would be highly desirable that the United Nations troops should occupy Korea at least up to the neck between Anshu and Eiko, which is about 100 miles north of the 38th parallel. This would apparently be a strategically defensible position, although preferably our control should extend up to the mountains.

Once a cease-fire agreement is reached, the Chinese Communists should be obligated to withdraw from Korea, and the unification of the country should then proceed under the impartial auspices of the United Nations. But under no conditions should we permit internal or external bands of Communists to overawe the people of Korea during the election campaign, and we should ultimately set up a United Nations police force to guard the boundaries and to train and equip a national army.

Is this all that we should do pending final settlement? I do not believe that it is. We are facing a world-wide drive of aggressive imperialism. To try to contain and restrain this drive was about all we could do until the free world awakened to the danger and took adequate steps to protect itself. But to rest solely on the defensive gives the advantage of movement and initiative to the imperialists and the aggressors. They can then mass their strength at our weakest point, secure in the knowledge that we shall not threaten them at other points. This gives the aggressors a tremendous tactical advantage since it requires a thin deployment of our forces over a wide front but permits them to concentrate heavily at those points which promise the most for them.

I believe, therefore, that it is proper to draw the cordon around China somewhat tighter and to take the counter-offensive in such a manner as to weaken the military power of the Chinese Communists without launching an all-out war with China on the mainland or provoking Russia to enter the war under conditions which would be disadvantageous to us.

Some fairly drastic steps are being currently advocated by General MacArthur and his supporters. I do not want to discuss these topics at this time since I have done so on other occasions and

my purpose tonight is one of attempting to increase rather than to diminish unity. But I do wish to suggest certain minimum steps which I would expect those who support General MacArthur's policies would most certainly favor, but which I hope will also be endorsed by the groups which now are either opposed to or indifferent about them.

First, we are now beginning to get the cooperation of other countries in shutting off war supplies to Communist China. This has been all too slow in coming since economic sanctions should obviously have been joined to military measures from the very beginning. The resolution now before the United Nations is, however, defective in that it allows each country to define war material as it wishes and does not set up any central enforcing machinery. But we should welcome it as a start upon which we can and should unite. It may well be that we should go further and institute a joint blockade conducted by as many nations as possible.

Second, we should give every possible aid to the democratic forces inside of China which are opposed to Communist tyranny. As far back as last year there were probably hundreds of thousands of guerillas operating in South and Southwest China. This number has increased in recent months, and this has been both a cause and a result of the mass executions which the Communists are staging.

It would be improper for me to spell out in any detailed manner, the specific forms which such aid might take. That would be like telegraphing our plans to our opponents. I shall, therefore, content myself by repeating that we should use *every* appropriate method to help these people to resist more effectively.

Third, without going into the question of whether we should aid Chiang Kai-shek's armies to make a mass invasion of the mainland, I see no harm, and on the contrary a possibility of substantial gain, in allowing his forces to make commando raids under their own power and at their own risk, and to engage in unorthodox warfare upon the Chinese mainland. This should be done without a direct use of American troops or convoys, although we could help to equip the Nationalist raiders.

Fourth, the Russian Communists have used organized propaganda and subversion to soften up the countries which they have sought to take over. That has been the function first of the "Comintern" and now of the "Cominform." These are allegedly private organizations for which the Russian government has tried to disavow official responsibility, but which are nevertheless instruments of their policy.

We should not stoop to such base tactics or such evil ends as the

Russians have used, but we should, in my judgment, develop and encourage similar organizations for counter-propaganda and underground activities within China and other Asiatic countries. I suggest, therefore, that we form an organization with some such name as the "Friends of a Free China," or "Friends of Free Asia," which can be an active force to encourage both democracy and resistance to Communism inside China as well as in other threatened countries. Such a group could be somewhat similar to the "Committee for a Free Europe" which is doing such good work in the West. Such an organization could raise, I am sure, large funds and find large numbers of supporters among Chinese, Malay and Indian friends of democracy. It could carry on propaganda and other activities inside of China which would spread the spirit of resistance and the devotion to freedom. By a strange coincidence, the wire services this afternoon brought notice of the creation of such a private committee in San Francisco. I rejoice in this step and hope we may all support it.

All of these methods when used together would materially weaken the hold of the present Communist rulers. Faced with aggressive enemies who are seeking our downfall, we can no longer continue a hands-off policy in relation to the internal affairs of Communist-controlled countries. They have been engaging in our internal affairs and in those of other countries for over thirty years. Because of our scruples about not interfering in the internal politics of other nations and allowing each set of peoples to make their own decisions, we have largely refrained from counter-propaganda activity. This has given the initiative to the Communists in the fields of propaganda, cultural activity and politics, as well as in military affairs.

It is time that we counter-attacked, not by invasion but by active propaganda and by aid to resistance movements. We can do so most properly because intervention to assist a people to throw off foreign domination and regain control of their country for themselves is the very opposite of the Communist intervention we condemn. We can do this most effectively in the satellite states. Unrest, indeed seething opposition, is already there. We can help to crystallize it and help further to undermine Russian control. We can do so without becoming officially involved in war, and under such a program we shall not have to fight the wrong people at the wrong time and place over the wrong issues.

If we can chip away at Russian strength in the satellite countries we shall indeed add a deterrent to Russia's making war. For it is the fear that the peoples of her puppet states may rebel if Russia goes to war which helps to hold back the rulers of the Kremlin

from starting World War III.

If some of the satellite countries can be persuaded to go further and actually overthrow their Communist masters and join the ranks of the democracies, we shall reduce still further the chances of war and begin to roll back the tide of tyranny upon Russia. We will make it a receding and not an advancing war.

At any event, matters have now gone too far for us to pursue a laissez-faire policy any longer. We should take the aggressive and carry our battle to the people of the Communist-controlled countries. We seek no control over them. We shall not select their rulers. The people of China will have the right of free choice. We want them to be free. Our cause is theirs, and we have more to gain by getting them to oppose Russia and Russian Communism than by trying to win the friendship of the satellite governments. For the latter are too much under the control of Moscow to respond to any such wooing.

V

I hope that the policies which I have suggested may appeal to men of good will who may have differed in the past and to men whose opinions still differ. The suggestions are modestly offered as a minimum program. If we carry them out with vigor and discretion, we can materially strengthen the position of the free nations with whom we are allied and weaken that of our real opponent, Russia.

I should like to close, however, on a note of caution. While we have one eye fixed on Europe and the other on Asia, it is quite possible that the Russians will strike right down the middle through the weak states of the Near and Middle East. If they succeed, they will not only cut the direct connection between the east and the west, but also take the oil without which Western Europe cannot operate. Since the problem is global, I urge therefore that the Near and Middle East not be neglected and that a new alliance based on Turkey, Greece, Israel and as many as possible of the Arab states be speedily formed. Then with a vigorous policy in Europe, Asia, and the Near East, we can gird ourselves with confidence for the struggle which faces us. May we close our ranks and go forward.

Address by

GENERAL EDWIN N. CLARK

President, China Institute in America

Mr. Toastmaster, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Mr. Luce, as Chairman of China Institute, has welcomed you. On behalf of my colleagues and myself I thank you for helping us celebrate our 25th anniversary of service in the cause of Chinese-American friendship. Your presence affirms this friendship. The need for such affirmation is greater today than ever before.

Today the world is torn by the conflict of ideologies and embroiled in both hot and cold wars. The shroud of Kremlin Communism has dropped over continental China. Chinese Communists are fighting us in Korea. The great majority of the Chinese people remain our friends, although their voice is temporarily silenced. This tragic situation need not be prolonged. In this crisis the United States must exercise her influence and lead us toward a free world. Military and economic power are deciding factors. But the foundation of enduring peace and an orderly world must be based, not on coercion, but on voluntary and friendly association of the peoples of all nations of the world. The Chinese people have been our friends for over a century. Will we keep them as our friends?

104 years ago the first three Chinese boys arrived at our shores, attended our schools and returned to China much enthused with what they had seen and what they had learned. They were the first Chinese disciples of American democracy. One of these young boys was Yung Wing who graduated from Yale in 1854. Fostered in an American home, imbued with the spirit of American ideals and of freedom, he conceived of bringing other Chinese students to America.

Through his efforts a steady stream of Chinese students began to flow. We believe that there are still resident in China about 10,000 Chinese graduates of American colleges and universities. In the United States there are over 3,600 Chinese students enrolled in 558 colleges and universities throughout the country and an additional number of at least 1,500 graduates and professionals. These students and scholars, these future leaders of China among us, are the most effective means of ensuring a free and reconstructed China.

For 25 years China Institute has been rendering service to Chinese students on a nation-wide scale. The Institute extends hospitality, counsel, emergency medical care, financial aid and on-the-job training with the cooperation of American individuals, organizations and industries interested in China. We have been and are administering hundreds of scholarships and fellowships.

However, we go beyond assisting Chinese students in their academic and professional training. One of our chief functions is to provide opportunities for our Chinese guests to know individual Americans, their homes and community life and to know and to understand American democracy.

We do not stop at making America known to our Chinese friends. True understanding and friendship must be rooted in reciprocity and partnership. Our courses on Chinese history and culture for American public school teachers are known all over the country. At our headquarters we graduate hundreds of teachers each year under the direct auspices of the New York Board of Education. In cooperation with local educational and civic leaders we have been conducting for eight years a most unique summer session on China and its people. The lecturers are chosen from among the best qualified Chinese scholars. To add the most essential human touch the American students are brought together with the Chinese lecturers in discussion as well as in social gatherings. This year we have arranged for forums on China to be held at Chautauqua and at Lakeside.

At our headquarters at China House, a thing of beauty in itself, we hold Chinese Art Exhibits, Lectures and Open Houses at which Chinese and Americans meet at frequent intervals throughout the year. During the last five years more than 50,000 Chinese and Americans have attended different meetings at China House.

Through our members and friendly organizations comparable programs have been activated in other sections of the country. Our aim is to enlist all friends of China to act in concert with us to extend our activities to all the important centers in America.

The Chinese students who have come to the United States have learned something of the spirit of America. While they are here we have created ambassadors of good will from America to China, with an understanding of America and its emphasis on freedom of the human being and on human dignity.

These students are the standard bearers in the struggle between the Chinese people desiring to be free and a Kremlin autocracy which desires to enslave them.

When China, the most populous and time-honored nation, becomes a free and democratic nation and joins hands again with the United States, then the foundation for a free world is more than half secure. The present crisis challenges us and the prospect inspires us.

We take pride in what China Institute is doing in these great causes—the cause of better understanding between the people of two great nations and the cause of liberty for the world.

本報專電：紐約華埠協社，於今晚七時，假溫大大酒店是光臨，舉行該社廿五週年紀念晚餐大會，到會者有聯廷魁、胡漢、張平書、梅貽琦、孟治、李錦綸及僑領暨中西來賓八百餘人，首由感出牧師主持祈禱，然後由宴會主席生活雜誌發行人路斯，請杜勒斯大使、勒斯克副國務卿及民主黨上議員打格拉斯，先後發表演說，各人講至美國總統，助國反攻，打

擊共黨侵略時，全場均報以熱烈掌聲，最後由現任華美協進社主席克拉克將軍答謝，席間賓主融洽，談笑風生，至深夜十一時，始興盡歡散會。

一期星 日一十月五年十四國民華中

報日洲美

中國人本身的責任！

從中美關係，見溝通中美文化，促進中美感情。蔣中正以來，由於負責人員的努力，由於各方人士的贊襄，成績頗為卓著；除了溝通中美文化，促進中外了解，對於穩定學生感情，教誨中美友誼之美，對於招徠學生入學，調劑學生生活，及協助學生解決經濟困難等項工作，也有很多很大的貢獻。

本年紀念日，除在該校禮堂舉行紀念會，跳舞會，表示慶祝外，並於同日下午八時，在本市華爾夫大旅館歡宴，宴的中西男女人士參加；參加人士，數在八百以上。由時代生活，及幸福二大雜誌總編輯韋恩先生担任主席，席間先從該誌聘聘韋恩等外交顧問兼總統對日和特使杜拉斯，國務院主管遠東事務助理，務卿謝克，依里奈有上議院議員道格拉斯二先生發表演說，一堂擠滿，其聲融融，情形至為熱烈。

CHINESE JOURNAL

美國務院決全力支持蔣援華 促中國軍民內外攻擊毛匪

△國會領袖道格拉士促請國軍反攻大陸
△杜勒斯指責北平傀儡組織主速探行動

合衆社十九日紐約電：華美協進社昨晚在華盛頓大旅館舉行廿五週年慶祝宴會，出席中美人士八百餘人。美國務院助理國務卿兼遠東司司長芮斯、國務院外交顧問勃斯、及美民主黨參議員道格拉斯均在會中發表重要演說，芮斯演詞，強調美華友好，並

、作工判談約和日對
與參權無黨毛

採取行動推翻
暴政，並並保
證，如國軍反
攻大陸，美國
將予全力支助
杜勒斯之演
詞，除支助
芮斯克之意見
外，並稱渠所
代表美國王特

之對日和約，決不許毛黨參加。臺灣領袖格拉斯提提出亞洲反攻方略：

- 一、封鎖中國大陸港
- 二、儘全力援助中國大陸上之反共游擊隊。
- 三、准許國軍在沿海登陸進攻毛匪。

奸漢大兩國中來年十二
具工任俄投東澤毛
狠兇尤國叛衛精逆汪較

杜勒斯十
八日晚在華美
協進社宴會上
證實毛澤東一
面倒向俄國慣
也，其任吏大
林工具，較之
汪精衛出賣中
國，投降日本
，其禍華之程
度，尤爲兇狠
台北十九

經國務院核准，代表該院
發表美國支持蔣總統，協
助國民政府反攻大陸，芮
斯克稱，美國決不承認毛
澤東，因北平係俄國控制
下，「斯拉夫滿洲國」，
渠不能代表中國，依其行

動而言，亦不是中國人。
美國現僅承認蔣總統所領
導之國民政府，並認其係
代表全中國人民之意見，
國民政府將繼續獲得美國
重要之援助。策勵鼓勵中
國人民在匪區一致起來，

報日洲美

The CHINESE JOURNAL

Vol. 21 No 118	Monday	May	21 1951
----------------	--------	-----	---------

匪近又施行所謂「大力鎮壓」，計有三批忠貞人士被屠殺，毛匪並下令沒收各地華產及廟宇財產。

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

THE NATION

In Time of Trouble

The U.S. State Department, in two speeches delivered in one night last week, cleared its voice, shifted its emphasis, and made what amounted to a dramatic shift in its Asia policy. It affirmed, as it never has so strongly since Chiang Kai-shek

Mao's China. No nation opposed it. Even India, Burma and Indonesia, who were among the eight who abstained, on the misty notion that it might spoil chances for peace, announced that they would support the embargo in practice. The five nations of the Soviet bloc refused to participate.

Uncertain leadership had bred uncertain friends. By vigorous leadership, the U.S. had kept 46 allies and yet gotten done something of what needed to be done. In time of trouble, it was a useful lesson.

Toward Firmer Ground

"We recognize the National Government of the Republic of China, even though the territory under its control is severely restricted. We believe it more authentically represents the view of the great body of the people of China, particularly the historic demand for the independence from foreign control. That government will continue to get important aid and assistance from the U.S."

With some astonishment, the audience on the Starlight Roof of Manhattan's Waldorf-Astoria recognized this as the voice of the U.S. State Department. The members of Manhattan's China Institute, which for 25 years had devoted itself to the nonpartisan cause of closer friendship between the Chinese and American people, represented every shade of opinion on the Far East themselves, but none had expected Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs Dean Rusk to speak with such firmness.

Two years ago, State had pronounced Chiang Kai-shek finished; one year ago, President Truman had declared that the U.S. would give him no more military aid, and State Department officials had argued privately that Mao Tse-tung was the Chi-

nese people's choice and had to be dealt with as such. Last week Dean Rusk told the China Institute diners flatly: "The Peiping regime . . . is not entitled to speak for China in the community of nations."

Over the heads of their "foreign masters," Rusk talked to the Chinese people, and warned them of worse to come. "The territorial integrity of China is now an



John Zimmerman
ASSISTANT SECRETARY RUSK
The dust settled.

quit the Chinese mainland, that Chiang's is the true government of China. As the second wave of Mao Tse-tung's human sea ebbed bloodily in Korea's dark hills, the State Department also proclaimed that China's Communist government is no more than a Kremlin puppet. The dust had taken a long time to settle, but apparently it had, and the State Department could now see clearly. Said Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk: "We do not recognize the authorities in Peiping for what they pretend to be. The Peiping regime may be a colonial Russian government . . . It is not the government of China. It does not pass the first test. It is not Chinese."

As the irresolution that had paralyzed U.S. policy in the Far East fell away, the United Nations caught new spirit, too. On U.S. urging, the Assembly voted 47 to 0 to impose an embargo on war materials to



International
AMBASSADOR DULLES
A puppet warned.

ironic phrase. The movement of Soviet forces into Sinkiang, the realities of 'joint exploitation' of that great province by Moscow and Peiping, the separation of Inner Mongolia from the body politic of China, and the continued inroads of Soviet power into Manchuria under the cloak of Korean aggression mean in fact that China is losing its great northern areas to the European empire which has stretched out its greedy hands for them for at least a century."

Outside China or inside, the U.S. would support those who opposed this foreign invasion. Said Rusk: "We can tell our friends in China that the U.S. will not acquiesce in the degradation which is being forced upon them."

Master & Disciple. Rusk compared Mao's government to those of another foreign invader—the Japanese puppet regimes of Manchukuo and Nanking. An-

U.S. WAR CASUALTIES

The Defense Department last week reported 1,462 more U.S. casualties in Korea, bringing the total since June to 64,354. Its figures still did not include casualties suffered in the Chinese offensive begun a month ago. The breakdown:

DEAD	11,112
WOUNDED	43,506
MISSING	9,621
CAPTURED	115

Total casualties by services: Army, 53,281; Marine Corps, 9,831; Navy, 689; Air Force, 553.

WITH ALL OUR STRENGTH

THE NATION'S PURPOSE IS FORTIFIED BY A GREAT REVERSAL OF POLICY ON ASIA

"If we quarrel with our past," Winston Churchill said in 1940, "we will destroy our future."

Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois quoted this remark in a speech last week and applied it to the great change for the better which is coming over U.S. world policy. He was speaking particularly of policy in Asia. But he was also relating this policy—as it should always be related—to the global policy and the global purposes of the U.S.

"I do not particularly care," said Senator Douglas, "whether or not a man honestly advocated a coalition government in China in 1946 and 1947 and wanted to 'let the dust settle' in 1948 and 1949. . . . My concern is instead about the future, over which we can exercise some control, rather than about the past which has gone beyond repair. I am willing to forget the past provided only that in the here and now men join to recognize Russian Communism for what it is; namely, a tyranny which seeks by aggression to impose the police state upon the world and which must be resisted by all our strength and with complete devotion."

It is fair to suppose that millions of Americans share this sentiment. The American people as a whole would be happy to unite behind a national administration and a national policy which between them "recognize Russian Communism for what it is" and resist it with "all our strength." Many, many Americans who have perceived the reluctance of President Truman and his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, to recognize the Communist enemy for what it is, and to resist it with anywhere near all our strength, would be happy to forget the past on Senator Douglas' condition that "in the here and now" the old mistakes and weaknesses are truly remedied.

The worst mistakes and weaknesses have been apparent in foreign policy, and especially in Asia policy. But they, like the remedies, begin at home. The most convincing evidence the Truman administration could give of a genuine will to bring "all our strength" to bear is to be found at home, in the way the President and his officials go about the mobilization of U.S. strength. The fact to date is that they are not even trying to mobilize "all our strength." If there is much in the past to be forgotten, there is much in the present to be improved.

"We can tell our friends"

Improvement is in sight, and those who have most vigorously questioned the past policies and attitudes of the Truman administration should be the first to recognize it. The President has at last begun to talk of measures necessary "to win the kind of struggle that the Kremlin has brought about." General MacArthur has turned out to be a powerful catalyst, stirring up and hastening a whole series of changes. Some of them, as LIFE reported last week, are evident in the approach of both the Administration and the U.N. to the Korean war. The most spectacular change manifested to date goes beyond Korea, to the heart of the American position in Asia. The occasion for bringing it into the open was a dinner sponsored in New York last week by the China Institute of America. Senator Douglas was one of the speakers. Two others were Ambassador John Foster Dulles and Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk. As a Republican who while serving the State Department retains a right of independent speech, Mr. Dulles might or might not have spoken for the Department. But Mr. Rusk, a career official whose special province is Far Eastern affairs, without doubt spoke for the State Department.

With his speech, Mr. Rusk completely reversed the past

and recent China policy of the U.S. government. If his words meant what in all conscience they must have meant, there is no further possibility of the U.S. government condoning the Communist conquest of China. There is no further possibility of the U.S. government consenting to the admission of the Chinese Communist government to the U.N. There is no further possibility of the U.S. government withholding from the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa the aid and encouragement due them as allies of the U.S. against Communism in Asia.

Mr. Rusk said that the Chinese Communists are the servants of the Soviet Communists and the enemies of the Chinese people. He said that the Chinese people will have "tremendous support" when and if they "move to assert their freedom"—the first strong word of encouragement given the millions of anti-Communist Chinese by a spokesman of the State Department. But his most significant statement, the statement which on its face basically altered U.S. policy, was in this passage:

"... We can tell our friends in China that the United States will not acquiesce in the degradation which is being forced upon them. We do not recognize the authorities in Peking for what they pretend to be. The Peking regime may be a colonial Russian government. . . . It is not the government of China. It does not pass the first test. It is not Chinese. It is not entitled to speak for China in the community of nations. . . . We recognize the National government of the Republic of China, even though the territory under its control is severely restricted. We believe it more authentically represents the views of the great body of the people of China, particularly their historic demand for independence from foreign control. That government will continue to receive important aid and assistance from the United States. . . ."

It's up to Mr. Acheson

Mr. Rusk's boss, the Secretary of State, will doubtless maintain that the speech changed nothing and reversed nothing—that the U.S. government has never condoned the Communist conquest of China, nor stood ready to give China's U.N. seat to the Communists, nor withheld due aid and recognition from the Chinese Nationalists. Since the Secretary and the public know better, this sort of equivocation will be unimportant *if* the attitudes and purposes so clearly stated in Mr. Rusk's speech are proved to be the actual attitudes and purposes of the U.S. government.

Ambassador Dulles spoke as if the new purposes of the U.S. included a firm intention to support anti-Communist resistance in China. Nailing down the long record of Soviet domination of the Chinese Communist party, he also recognized the hard fact that the Communists are strongly placed in China. "We cannot," he said, "overnight undo what has been accomplished by the best brains and skills of the Soviet Communist party working [in China] with substantial resources over a span of 30 years."

That is true. It is also true that the U.S. State Department cannot undo overnight what Dean Acheson, Ambassador-at-large Philip Jessup and others of their view have accomplished in their very recent past. Their fixed purpose has been to accept the Communist conquest of China and, as Mr. Acheson put it in December 1949, shake loose from the Chinese Nationalists. Without quarreling with the past, anyone is bound to wonder whether a Secretary of State with his past can effectively apply the policy spelled out last week. But a strong, new policy is on the record. Mr. Acheson must now show that he can execute it.



CHINA INSTITUTE IN AMERICA

125 EAST 65TH STREET, NEW YORK 21, N. Y.

The Board of Trustees of China Institute in America takes pleasure in sending you the enclosed booklet containing the speeches delivered at our Twenty-fifth Anniversary Dinner.

Inasmuch as these talks have created considerable comment, we felt that you would like to have them to read at your leisure.

The Board of Trustees are deeply appreciative that the Twenty-fifth Anniversary Dinner of China Institute served as the occasion for the presentation of historic viewpoints on China.

*Those who join the Trustees in sponsoring the
25th Anniversary Dinner of China Institute are:*

CHARLES EDISON, *Chairman*

WINTHROP W. ALDRICH
THE HONORABLE WARREN R. AUSTIN
CHESTER I. BARNARD
JAMES M. BECK
SOSTHENES BEHN
PAUL BELLAMY
JAMES G. BLAINE
HARVIE BRANSCOMB
THE HONORABLE WILLIAM C. BULLITT
HUGH BULLOCK
W. RANDOLPH BURGESS
CASS CANFIELD
WOODROW CHAN
MAJOR GENERAL C. L. CHENNAULT
COLBY M. CHESTER
WILLIAM L. CLAYTON
THE REVEREND EVERETT R. CLINCHY
THE HONORABLE JOHN W. DAVIS
HENRY P. DAVISON
WILLIAM ADAMS DELANO
THE HONORABLE THOMAS E. DEWEY
GENERAL WILLIAM J. DONOVAN
THE HONORABLE ALFRED E. DRISCOLL
THE HONORABLE JAMES H. DUFF
GANO DUNN
BENJAMIN F. FAIRLESS
THE HONORABLE JAMES A. FARLEY
HARRY HARKNESS FLAGLER
RAYMOND B. FOSDICK
MANSFIELD FREEMAN
BERNARD F. GIMBEL
WILLIAM GREEN
PETER GRIMM
OSCAR HAMMERSTEIN II
MRS. J. BORDEN HARRIMAN
CHIN HAN
CONRAD N. HILTON
MRS. HIRAM HOUGHTON
EDWARD F. HUTTON
THE HONORABLE IRVING M. IVES
THE HONORABLE WALTER H. JUDD
H. V. KALTENBORN
MEYER KESTNBAUM
ALLAN P. KIRBY
THOMAS S. LAMONT
SIGURD S. LARSEN
LING LEW
K. C. LI
THE HONORABLE JOHN DAVIS LODGE

THE RT. REV. MONSIGNOR
JAMES J. LYNCH
RALPH McCALLISTER
THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK
THOMAS H. McINNERNEY
THE HONORABLE PAUL V. McNUTT
GENERAL GEORGE C. MARSHALL
J. A. MARTINO
CLARK H. MINOR
AARON P. MITCHELL
MAURICE T. MOORE
NEWBOLD MORRIS
THE MOST REVEREND
G. BROMLEY OXNAM
WILLIAM S. PALEY
THOMAS I. PARKINSON
WARREN LEE PIERSON
MRS. JOHN SARCENT PILLSBURY
THE REVEREND DR. DAVID DeSOLA POOL
ALBERT T. QUON
HENRY G. RITER III
DUDLEY ROBERTS, JR.
PAUL R. SCHEERER
CARL J. SCHWEINLER
LOUIS B. SELTZER
CARROL M. SHANKS
THE HONORABLE H. ALEXANDER SMITH
THE REVEREND RALPH W. SOCKMAN
J. P. SPANG, JR.
ROBERT GORDON SPROUL
CORNELIUS V. STARR
THE HONORABLE ADLAI E. STEVENSON
ROGER W. STRAUS
ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER
GERARD SWOPE
HERBERT B. SWOPE
THE HONORABLE ROBERT A. TAFT
ORDWAY TEAD
JUAN T. TRIPPE
HARRISON TWEED
THE REVEREND HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
THOMAS J. WATSON
GENERAL A. C. WEDEMEYER
THE HONORABLE SUMNER WELLES
THE HONORABLE G. MENNEN WILLIAMS
MRS. WENDELL WILLKIE
THE REVEREND PAUL A. WOLFE
MATTHEW WOLL
HENRY M. WRISTON
ROBERT R. YOUNG

CHINA INSTITUTE IN AMERICA

HONORARY PRESIDENTS:

HON. V. K. WELLINGTON KOO

HON. J. LEIGHTON STUART

TRUSTEES:

HENRY R. LUCE, *Chairman of the Board*

EDWIN N. CLARK, *President*

A. M. LEDERER *Vice-President*

MRS. M. T. MOORE *Vice-President*

THOMAS J. WATSON, JR. *Vice-President*

C. F. YAU *Vice-President*

EDWARD H. HUME *Secretary*

HOLLIS P. GALE *Treasurer*

VIRGINIA RUNTON *Assistant Treasurer*

FRANK ALTSCHUL

WILLIAM P. HUNT

BROMWELL AULT

H. H. K'UNG

MRS. W. MURRAY CRANE

K. C. LI

ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC

C. T. LOO

L. CARRINGTON GOODRICH

WALTER H. MALLORY

PIERRE F. GOODRICH

Y. C. MEI

HU SHIH

MRS. CHARLES MERZ

DIRECTOR:

CHIH MENG